



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/941,459	09/30/1997	TAKESHI MORIKAWA	05058/58201	6001

24367 7590 07/13/2005

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 NORTH HARWOOD
SUITE 3400
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

POKRZYWA, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/941,459

Applicant(s)

MORIKAWA, TAKESHI

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 13-16 and 23-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 13-16 and 23-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 4/25/05, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 4-6, 13-16, and 23-35** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/05 regarding the rejection of **claims 31-35**, as cited in the Office action dated 1/26/05, as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,383,754) in view of Yoshiura *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 4,739,369), have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. In response to applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of *claim 31*, whereby applicant argues on pages 2 and 3 that Sumida fails to teach of editing means and a controller for permitting/prohibiting operation of this editing means. Upon review of Sumida, the examiner notes that the CPU 200 and 201, as seen in Figs. 4A and 4B, of the digital copier can be interpreted as an editing means. Particularly, as read in column 16, line 7-column 17, line 23, CPU's (a) and (b) (being 200 and 201) perform the copying operation. This copying operation includes editing pixel density data, as read in column 17, lines 15-18, from the pixel density data stored in the memory (bit map page memory 207), as read in column 24, lines 50-column 25, line 36. Thus, the CPU's 200 and 201 act as means for editing pixel density data from the pixel density data stored in the memory.

Art Unit: 2622

4. Continuing, Sumida teaches in column 28, lines 36-66, that the document size is detected by counting the number of pixels in a subscanning direction. Further, Sumida discloses of determining a size of an image, as read in column 29, line 55-column 30, line 29, which states that "Any two of the four sides of a document are assumed to be binding margins on the basis of the size of the document", and "when the document is determined to be vertically long by conventional document size detection, the binding position is determined on the basis of X1 and X2 stored in the counter latch 513". With this, Sumida can be interpreted as teaching of a means for editing pixel density data from the pixel density data stored in the memory (CPU's 200 and 201, seen in Figs. 4A and 4B), and means for determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data of each image stored in the memory (sheet size sensor, as seen in Fig. 4B, as well as the key counter seen in Fig. 5B-1), as currently claimed.

5. Finally, Sumida teaches of means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform in size, as seen in Figs. 60 and 61, whereby steps S189-S192 are performed when the determined size are uniform (which would include having the same orientation, being "yes" in step S188). Further, Sumida discloses in Fig. 60 ("no" in step 188), and in column 36, lines 1-46, that when the orientation of images is different, thereby having the determined size not being uniform with each other, the copying operation, which is performed by the CPU's 200 and 201, is inhibited. Thus, Sumida can be interpreted as teaching of means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of

Art Unit: 2622

originals are uniform in size and otherwise prohibiting the means for editing from editing an image.

6. Continuing, also regarding the rejection of *claim 31*, applicant further argues on page 3 that the reference of Yoshiura fails to teach of means for editing. The examiner notes that Yoshiura is being utilized to teach of a document feeder that is capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder. As discussed above, Sumida teaches of a means for editing, means for determining a size of an image, and means for controlling the means for editing. Further, Sumida teaches of a feeder capable of feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 15, lines 9 through 24), and means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals collectively set in the feeder (column 17, lines 2 through 60).

7. However, Sumida fails to particularly disclose if the feeder is capable of *successively* feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals *of different sizes* collectively set in the feeder. Yoshiura discloses an image forming apparatus (see Fig. 2) comprising a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8, lines 3-42), and means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feeder teachings of Yoshiura within the system of Sumida, as Sumida's system would become more efficient, since the system would be capable of utilizing any size original to be successively fed through the

Art Unit: 2622

feeder, whereby an operator would realize an abnormal copying function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51.

8. Therefore, the rejection of **claim 31**, under 35 U.S.C.103(a), as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* in view of Yoshiura *et al.*, is maintained and repeated in this Office action.

Further, for the same reasons discussed above (and for reasons discussed below in claim 34), the rejection of dependent **claim 32**, also under 35 U.S.C.103(a), as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* in view of Yoshiura *et al.*, is also maintained and repeated in this Office action.

9. Continuing, regarding the rejection of **claims 33 and 35**, applicant argues on page 4 and page 6 that Sumida fails to teach of permitting or prohibiting operation of a stapler based upon the size of the image of originals. As discussed above with respect to claim 31, Sumida teaches of determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data in column 28, lines 36-66, and in column 29, line 55-column 30, line 29. Further, as seen in Figs. 68 and 69, and read in column 39, line 43-column 40, line 62, upon determining that the originals are not uniform in size, which includes the orientation of the sheets, a stapling operation is inhibited. Thus, Sumida can be interpreted as teaching of means for determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data of each image stored in the memory, and means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the stapler to operate when the images are uniform in size and otherwise prohibits the operation of the stapler.

10. Further, as discussed above, the secondary reference of Yoshiura is utilized to teach of a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8, lines 3-42), and means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of

Art Unit: 2622

originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38).

With this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feeder teachings of Yoshiura within the system of Sumida, as Sumida's system would become more efficient, since the system would be capable of utilizing any size original to be successively fed through the feeder, whereby the system would inhibit an abnormal stapling function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51.

11. Therefore, the rejection of **claim 33**, under 35 U.S.C.103(a), as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* in view of Yoshiura *et al.*, is maintained and repeated in this Office action.

Similarly, for the same reasons discussed above, the rejection of **claim 35**, under 35 U.S.C.103(a), as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* in view of Yoshiura *et al.*, is maintained and repeated in this Office action.

12. Continuing, regarding the rejection of **claim 34**, applicant argues on pages 5 and 6 that Sumida and Yoshiura fail to teach of means for editing pixel density data in a manner suitable to provide two images on a single side of a sheet.

As discussed above, Sumida teaches in Figs. 4A and 4B of CPU's 200 and 201, which can be interpreted as means for editing the data, as is read in column 16, line 58-column 17, line 24. Further, in column 24, line 50-column 25, line 14, Sumida teaches that the images can be changed via a magnification ratio as part of the copying operation. Additionally, Sumida teaches of means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform

Art Unit: 2622

in size, as seen in Figs. 60 and 61, whereby steps S189-S192 are performed when the determined size are uniform (which would include having the same orientation, being “yes” in step S188) and otherwise prohibiting the operation of the means for editing (being “no” in step S188).

Continuing, upon review of Sumida, the examiner finds that the reference can be interpreted as providing two images on a single side of a sheet, as in column 12, lines 56-67, Sumida states that “a multiple image transferring function ... is executed to produce any desired kind of copy”.

Thus, by transferring multiple images, Sumida is providing at least two images on a side of paper. Further, as read in column 20, lines 33-column 21, line 43, Sumida teaches of a “memory managing unit (MMU) 330 controls the memory unit 292 such that the latter inputs two input data and outputs single output data at the same time”. While these interpretations are different than having two scanned originals being provided on one output page, it is noted that as the claim is currently written, Sumida can be interpreted as teaching this limitation.

13. Therefore, along with the reasons discussed above regarding claim 31, the rejection of **claim 34**, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* in view of Yoshiura *et al.*, is maintained and repeated in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. **Claims 31-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumida *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,383,754, cited in the Office action dated 1/26/05) in view of Yoshiura *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 4,739,369, cited in the Office action dated 1/26/05).

Regarding *claim 31*, Sumida discloses an image formation apparatus (see abstract, and Fig. 1) comprising a sensor for reading an image on an original (column 17, line 25 through column 18, line 57), a memory for storing pixel density data read by the sensor (bit map page memory 207, column 19, lines 4 through 37, and column 24, line 50 through column 25, line 36), means for editing pixel density data from the pixel density data stored in the memory (CPU 200 and 201, as seen in Figs. 4A and 4B, column 16, line 7 through column 17, line 24), an image forming portion for using edited pixel density data to print an image (column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 43, and column 19, lines 4 through 30), a feeder capable of feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 15, lines 9 through 24), means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals collectively set in the feeder (column 17, lines 2 through 60), means for determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data of each image stored in the memory (column 28, lines 36-66, and column 29, line 55-column 30, line 29), and means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform in size (see Figs. 60 and 61, column 36, lines 1-46) and otherwise prohibiting the means for editing from editing an image (see Figs. 60 and 61, column 36, lines 1-46).

However, Sumida fails to expressly disclose if the feeder is capable of *successively* feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals *of different sizes* collectively set in the feeder.

Yoshiura discloses an image forming apparatus (see Fig. 2) comprising a sensor for reading an image on an original (column 7, lines 10-56), a memory for storing data read by the

Art Unit: 2622

sensor (column 9, lines 26-65), means for editing data from the data stored in the memory (column 9, lines 26-65, and column 11, lines 24-61), an image forming portion for using edited data to print an image (column 7, lines 10-56), a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8, lines 3-42), means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38), means for determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data of each image stored in the memory (column 10, line 2-column 11, line 23), and means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform in size (column 11, lines 39-61).

Sumida & Yoshiura are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being copying systems, with both having an automatic document feeder to feed originals to be read. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a feeder taught by Yoshiura that successively feeds different size originals and subsequently, reading the originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder, within the system of Sumida. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Sumida's system would become more efficient with the inclusion of Yoshiura's teachings, since an operator would be allowed to realize an abnormal copying function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yoshiura with the system of Sumida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Regarding *claim 32*, Sumida and Yoshiura disclose the apparatus discussed above in claim 31, and Sumida further teaches that the means for editing data edits an image in the manner suitable for providing two images for printing on a single side of a sheet (column 12, line 53-column 13, line 36, and column 20, lines 33-column 21, line 43).

Regarding *claim 33*, Sumida discloses an image formation apparatus (see abstract, and Fig. 1) comprising a sensor for reading an image on an original (column 17, line 25 through column 18, line 57), a memory for storing data read by the sensor (bit map page memory 207, column 19, lines 4 through 37, and column 24, line 50 through column 25, line 36), an image forming portion for using edited data stored in the memory to print an image (column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 43, and column 19, lines 4 through 30), a stapler for stapling a plurality of sheets each bearing a formed image thereon (column 15, lines 26 through 52), a feeder capable of feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 15, lines 9 through 24), means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals collectively set in the feeder (column 17, lines 2 through 60), means for determining a size of an image corresponding to data of each image stored in the memory (column 28, lines 36-66, and column 29, line 55-column 30, line 29), and means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the stapler to operate when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform in size (Figs. 60, 61, 68, and 69, column 36, lines 1-46, and column 39, line 43-column 40, line 62) and otherwise prohibiting the stapler from operating (Figs. 60, 61, 68, and 69, column 36, lines 1-46, and column 39, line 43-column 40, line 62).

However, Sumida fails to expressly disclose if the feeder is capable of *successively* feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals of *different sizes* collectively set in the feeder.

Yoshiura discloses an image forming apparatus (see Fig. 2) comprising a sensor for reading an image on an original (column 7, lines 10-56), a memory for storing data read by the sensor (column 9, lines 26-65), means for editing data from the data stored in the memory (column 9, lines 26-65, and column 11, lines 24-61), an image forming portion for using edited data to print an image (column 7, lines 10-56), a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8, lines 3-42), means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38), means for determining a size of an image corresponding to the pixel density data of each image stored in the memory (column 10, line 2-column 11, line 23), and means for controlling, responsive to the means for determining, which permits the means for editing to edit an image when all images corresponding to the plurality of originals are uniform in size (column 11, lines 39-61).

Sumida & Yoshiura are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being copying systems, with both having an automatic document feeder to feed originals to be read. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a feeder taught by Yoshiura that successively feeds different size originals and subsequently, reading the originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder, within the system of Sumida. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Sumida's system would become more efficient with the inclusion of Yoshiura's teachings, since an

Art Unit: 2622

operator would be allowed to realize an abnormal copying function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yoshiura with the system of Sumida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

Regarding *claim 34*, Sumida discloses an image formation apparatus (see abstract, and Fig. 1) comprising a feeder capable of feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 15, lines 9 through 24), a reader for reading a plurality of originals collectively set in the feeder (column 17, lines 2 through 60), a memory for storing pixel density data corresponding to a plurality of images (bit map page memory 207, column 19, lines 4 through 37, and column 24, line 50 through column 25, line 36), means for editing the pixel density data stored in the memory (CPU 200 and 201, as seen in Figs. 4A and 4B, column 16, line 7 through column 17, line 24) in a manner suitable for providing two images on a single side of a sheet (column 12, line 53-column 13, line 36, and column 20, lines 33-column 21, line 43), and means for controlling, which permits the means for editing to operate when all the pixel density data stored in the memory are uniform in image size (see Figs. 60 and 61, column 36, lines 1-46) and otherwise prohibiting the means for editing from operating (see Figs. 60 and 61, column 36, lines 1-46).

However, Sumida fails to expressly disclose if the feeder is capable of *successively* feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals *of different sizes* collectively set in the feeder.

Yoshiura discloses an image forming apparatus (see Fig. 2) comprising a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8,

Art Unit: 2622

lines 3-42), a reader for reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38), a memory for storing data corresponding to a plurality of images (column 9, lines 26-65), means for editing the data stored in the memory in a manner suitable for providing two images on a single side of a sheet (column 2, lines 17-60, column 9, lines 26-65, and column 11, lines 24-61), and means for controlling, which permits the means for editing to operate when all data stored in the memory are uniform in size (column 11, lines 39-61).

Sumida & Yoshiura are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being copying systems, with both having an automatic document feeder to feed originals to be read. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Yoshiura that successively feeds and reads different size originals within the system of Sumida. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Sumida's system would become more efficient with the inclusion of Yoshiura's teachings, since an operator would be allowed to realize an abnormal copying function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yoshiura with the system of Sumida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

Regarding *claim 35*, Sumida discloses an image formation apparatus (see abstract, and Fig. 1) comprising a feeder capable of feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 15, lines 9 through 24), a reader for reading a plurality of originals collectively set in the feeder (column 17, lines 2 through 60), a memory for storing pixel density data corresponding to a plurality of images (bit map page memory 207, column 19, lines 4

Art Unit: 2622

through 37, and column 24, line 50 through column 25, line 36), a print portion for forming an image on a sheet from the pixel density data stored in the memory (column 13, line 65 through column 14, line 43, and column 19, lines 4 through 30), a stapler for stapling a plurality of printed sheets (column 15, lines 26 through 52), and a controller for which permits the stapler to operate when all of the plurality of printed sheets have images formed thereon from the pixel density data stored in the memory which are uniform in size (Figs. 60, 61, 68, and 69, column 36, lines 1-46, and column 39, line 43-column 40, line 62) and otherwise prohibiting the stapler from operating (Figs. 60, 61, 68, and 69, column 36, lines 1-46, and column 39, line 43-column 40, line 62).

However, Sumida fails to expressly disclose if the feeder is capable of *successively* feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position, and reading a plurality of originals *of different sizes* collectively set in the feeder.

Yoshiura discloses an image forming apparatus (see Fig. 2) comprising a feeder capable of successively feeding originals having different sizes to an image reading position (column 8, lines 3-42), means for reading mixed originals for reading a plurality of originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder (column 9, line 60-column 10, line 38), a memory for storing data corresponding to a plurality of images (column 9, lines 26-65), a print portion for forming an image on a sheet from the data stored in the memory (column 7, lines 10-56), means for editing the data stored in the memory (column 9, lines 26-65, and column 11, lines 24-61), and a controller which permits the means for editing to operate when all the plurality of printed sheets have images formed thereon from the data stored in the memory which are uniform in size (column 11, lines 39-61).

Sumida & Yoshiura are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being copying systems, with both having an automatic document feeder to feed originals to be read. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a feeder taught by Yoshiura that successively feeds different size originals and subsequently, reading the originals of different sizes collectively set in the feeder, within the system of Sumida. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that Sumida's system would become more efficient with the inclusion of Yoshiura's teachings, since an operator would be allowed to realize an abnormal copying function based on automatically detected differing original sizes, as recognized by Yoshiura in column 2, lines 39-51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yoshiura with the system of Sumida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 35.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. **Claims 4-6, 13-16, and 23-30** are allowed.

17. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding ***claims 4, 13, and 28***, in the examiner's opinion, it would not have been obvious to have the systems, as claimed, include an operational panel for selecting operable modes of operation, whereby the display and selection of an inoperable mode of operation through the operation panel is automatically prohibited based on the result of the comparison between the state of at least two frames. The closest prior art, Sumida *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,383,754), fails to teach these limitations, and the examiner finds no motivation to combine

Art Unit: 2622

Sumida with other references to achieve the desired outcome. Because of this, the claims are rendered allowable.

Regarding *claim 23*, in the examiner's opinion, it would not have been obvious to have the system, as claimed, include a memory for storing a plurality of print jobs, with each print job containing pixel density data of at least two frames, a print-job selector for selecting one of the plurality of print jobs stored in the memory, and a state decision controller for determining, for each frame, a state of a frame of the pixel density data contained in the selected print-job.

The closest prior art, Sumida *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 5,383,754), fails to teach these limitations, and the examiner finds no motivation to combine Sumida with other references to achieve the desired outcome. Because of this, the claim is rendered allowable.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2622

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joe Pokrzywa whose telephone number is (571) 272-7410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph R. Pokrzywa
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622



jrj